arXiv:1207.5105v1 [quant-ph] 21 Jul 2012

Discord and quantum computational resources

Aharon Brodutch
Department of Physics & Astronomy, Faculty of Science, Macquarie University, NSW 2109, Australia[*]

(Dated: July 24, 2012)

Discordant states appear in a large number of quantum phenomena and seem to be a good indicator of divergence from classicality. While there is evidence that they are essential for a quantum algorithm to have an advantage over a classical one, their precise role is unclear. We examine the role of discord in quantum computation using the paradigmatic framework of *restricted distributed quantum gates* and show that manipulating discordant states using local operations has an associated cost in terms of entanglement and communication resources. Changing discord reduces the total correlations and operations on discordant states require entanglement resources. Discord is, however, only the last in a hierarchy of similar quantities which we call K-discord, each restricting the kinds of operations that can be performed without entanglement resources.

In recent years quantum discord and similar quantities have become an actively studied topic. There is mounting evidence that discordant states play an essential role in a wide variety of quantum phenomena (see [1] and references therein). In many cases discord seems to act as a more natural measure of quantum correlations then entanglement [1, 2], and has sometimes been hailed as an essential resource for mixed state quantum computation [3]. The term *resource* is, however, debatable, mainly due to the fact that very few limitations have been found on the creation and manipulation of discord. Most notably, unlike entanglement, discord can be created and increased using local operations.

Nevertheless, there is strong evidence that discordant states play a role in mixed state quantum computation and discord is in many ways an indication of the divergence from classicality [1, 3]. Discord has also been related to entanglement in various ways. One operational example is the link between entanglement resources and the manipulation of discordant states using local operations and classical communication (LOCC) [4]. This relation is based on the fact that there is no local, rank-1, positive operator valued measurement (POVM) that leaves a discordant state invariant.

The restriction of the measurements to rank-1 comes from the original definition of discord as a measure of quantum correlations [1, 5–7]. This definition naturally selects measurements that maximize information gain. However, when discussing LOCC protocols it is often useful to make measurements that reveal less information and are consequently less disturbing. In this regard a more general version of discord needs to be considered. A similar issue was recently discussed in [8] in relation to local unitary operations.

In this paper we tackle a number of problems described above. First we show that changing discord using local operations has an associated cost in terms of mutual information. Next we define a version of discord that takes into account measurements with less outcomes then the dimension of the state. We use this version of discord to extend the results of [4] into more general types of states including those used in NMR quantum computation. Changing discord in an ensemble of these states, without information loss, requires non-local resources.

Quantum correlations - The total correlation in a quantum system that is shared by two parties, Alice and Bob, is given by the mutual information $I(A:B) = S(\rho_{AB}||\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)$ where $S(\rho||\tau) = \mathrm{tr}\,(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \tau)$ is the relative entropy and ρ_A and ρ_B the local states of Alice and Bob respectively. We can define quantum discord as the minimal change in mutual information after the application of a rank-1 POVM [9]: $D(B|A) = \min_{\{\bar{E}_a\}}[I(AB) - I(A'B')]$. Here ρ_{AB} is the initial state, $\rho'_{AB} = \sum_a M_a \rho_{AB} M_a^\dagger$ is the state after the POVM $\{\bar{E}_a\}$ with elements $\bar{E}_a = M_a^\dagger M_a$ and the bar signifies that the elements are rank-1 (note that ρ'_A may have a different dimension then ρ_A). Alternatively it can be written as [1, 6]

$$D(B|A) = I(A:B) - \max_{\{E_a\}} \sum_a p_a S(\rho_{B|E_a}||\rho_B), \qquad (1)$$

where $\rho_{B|E_a}$ is the state of Bob's system after a measurement by Alice with outcome a. One important feature of discord is that it is zero if and only if the state is of the form [5], $\rho_{AB} = \sum_a p_a \Pi_a \otimes \rho_{B|a}$, where $\{\Pi_a\}$ is a set of orthogonal projectors. Discord is regarded as the quantum part of the correlations [5] and $J(B|A) = I(A:B) - D(B|A)$ is a measure of the classical part [6].

Discord, classical correlations and mutual information are invariant under local unitary operations. Mutual information and classical correlations are also non-increasing under local operations [6]. Discord on the other hand can both increase and decrease under local operations [1]. Both discord and classical correlations are not symmetric under the interchange of the subsystems, without loss of generality we always consider the discord under a POVM on Alice's system.

Discord and local operations- To show that changing discord implies the loss of correlations we will use

---

[*] Electronic address: cap.fwiffo@gmail.com

a special case of Petz's theorem [10, 11] regarding the reversibility of completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) operations.

Lemma 1. *Given two states ρ_{AB} and $\tau_{AB} = \tau_A \otimes \tau_B$ and a local (CPTP) operation Λ_A on Alice's side, the equality $S[\rho_{AB}||\tau_{AB}] = S[\Lambda_A(\rho_{AB})||\Lambda_A(\tau_{AB})]$ holds if and only if there exists a local operation Λ^*_A such that $\Lambda^*_A\Lambda_A[(\tau_{AB})] = \tau_{AB}$ and $\Lambda^*_A[\Lambda_A(\rho_{AB})] = \rho_{AB}$ [12].*

This lemma implies that a local operation made by Alice will change the mutual information unless it can be reversed locally. We can now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *If a local operation $\Lambda(\rho_{AB}) = \rho'_{AB}$ changes discord, $D(B|A) \neq D(B'|A')$, it also decreases mutual information, $I(\rho_{AB}) > I(\rho'_{AB})$.*

Alternatively, using the fact that local operations cannot increase mutual information, the theorem reads:

For a local operation $\Lambda(\rho_{AB}) = \rho'_{AB}$ we have $I(\rho_{AB}) = I(\rho'_{AB}) \Rightarrow D(B|A) = D(B'|A')$.

Proof. First we show that discord cannot be decreased without affecting mutual information. Neither mutual information, $I(A:B)$, nor classical correlation, $J(B|A)$, can increase under local operations [6]. Using $I(A:B) = J(B|A) + D(B|A)$ we see that decreasing discord reduces mutual information by at least the same amount.

To show that discord cannot be increased we use lemma 1. The operation Λ must be reversible if mutual information dose not change. If Λ increases discord without changing mutual information then its reverse can decrease discord without changing mutual information, violating the first part of the proof. □

Theorem 1 implies that any *change* in discord using local operations is associated with information loss. This loss can sometimes be reversed by LOCC and previous knowledge about the initial state. In what follows we will show that operations taking ensembles of initial states to final states require non-local resources if discord changes. This is a consequence of the effects of measurements on discordant states.

The information loss due to local measurements imposes strong restrictions on the implementation of bilocal operations [4]. Discord typically changes after local measurements that reveal maximal information. However, one may minimize the information loss by making measurements that reveal less information, for example, by performing measurements with fewer possible outcomes. To take such measurements into account we define a more general version of discord.

K-discord - The number of elements in a POVM correspond to the number of possible outcomes. We define the *K − discord* as the minimal change in correlations after a POVM with at least K *elements.*

$$D^K(B|A) = \min_{\{E_a\}_{\geq K}} [I(\rho_{AB}) - I(\rho'_{AB})]. \tag{2}$$

where ρ'_{AB} is the state after the measurement. The precise implementation of the POVM is taken into account in the minimization. Measurement results are encoded in such a way that they can be discriminated perfectly. Without loss of generality we can say that, after the measurement, the state, including the measurement device $\tilde{A}$, is of the form

$$\rho'_{\tilde{A}AB} = \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|_{\tilde{A}} \otimes \rho'_{AB|i}, \tag{3}$$

where $\langle i_{\tilde{A}}|j_{\tilde{A}}\rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $\rho_{AB|i} \neq \rho_{AB|j}$ for $i \neq j$. It is also useful to describe the measurement process with one intermediate step. We start with the measurement device in a pure state so $\rho_{\tilde{A}AB} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{AB}$. Next we apply a unitary transformation U on $\tilde{A}A$

$$\rho''_{\tilde{A}AB} = U\rho_{\tilde{A}AB}U^\dagger \tag{4}$$

Finally we dephase to obtain the state ρ' of eq. 3. This procedure allows us to find the precise structure of the K-classical states defined below.

Definition 1. *A state is called K-classical if either $D^K(A|B) = 0$ or $D^K(B|A) = 0$.*

Theorem 2. *A state ρ_{AB} satisfies $D^K(B|A) = 0$ if and only if there exists a set of K orthogonal projectors Π_{A_i} such that $\sum_{i=1}^K \Pi_{A_i} = \mathbb{1}_A$ and*

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \Pi_{A_i}\rho_{AB}\Pi_{A_i} \tag{5}$$

Proof. The states with the property $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^K \Pi_{A_i}\rho_{AB}\Pi_{A_i}$ are by construction of the type $D^K(B|A) = 0$.

For the inverse we use the sequence $\rho_{\tilde{A}AB} \to \rho''_{\tilde{A}AB} \to \rho'_{\tilde{A}AB}$ described above with a n element POVM, $n \geq K$. Since local unitary transformations and adding subsystems do not change mutual information, and local operations, such as tracing out a subsystem, may only decrease it we have $I(A:B) = I(\tilde{A}A:B) = I(\tilde{A}''A'':B'') \geq I(\tilde{A}'A':B') \geq I(A':B')$. We require equality for each of the mutual information terms above.

The equality $I(\tilde{A}'A':B') = I(A':B')$ is equivalent to saturating strong subadditivity [11] (Appendix A) so the state $\rho'_{\tilde{A}AB}$ which is by construction of the form of eq. 3 must be of the form

$$\rho'_{\tilde{A}AB} = \sum_{\tilde{a}=1}^{n} p_{\tilde{a}} |\tilde{a}\rangle\langle\tilde{a}|_{\tilde{A}} \otimes \rho_{AB|\tilde{a}} \tag{6}$$

where $\rho_{AB|\tilde{a}} = \Pi'_{A_{\tilde{a}}}\rho_{AB|\tilde{a}}\Pi'_{A_{\tilde{a}}}$ and $\Pi'_{A_{\tilde{a}}}$ are orthogonal projectors (see Appendix A for details).

At the second step of the process we require the equality $I(\tilde{A}''A'':B) = I(A'':B'')$ since $\rho''_{AB} = \rho'_{AB}$. This also implies that $\rho''_{AB} = \sum_{\tilde{a}} p_{\tilde{a}}\rho_{AB|\tilde{a}}$. Since the equality above saturates strong subadditivity and we already require the structure of eq. 6 we must have $\rho''_{\tilde{A}AB} = \sum_{\tilde{a}=1}^{k} p_{\tilde{a}} \rho_{\tilde{A}|\tilde{a}} \otimes \rho_{AB|\tilde{a}}$. In the dephasing basis, $\rho_{\tilde{A}|\tilde{a}}$ cannot contain any other diagonal elements than $|\tilde{a}\rangle\langle\tilde{a}|$ which means $\rho_{\tilde{A}|\tilde{a}} = |\tilde{a}\rangle\langle\tilde{a}|$ and $\rho''_{\tilde{A}AB} = \rho'_{\tilde{A}AB}$. Reversing the operation of the unitary keeps the structure of the state in the disjoint subspaces which proves that the state is of the structure $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Pi_{A_i} \rho_{AB} \Pi_{A_i}$. Since $n \geq K$ we get eq. 5.

□

If the measured system is of dimension d then the d-discord is equivalent to discord, $D(B|A) = D^d(B|A)$. In the case of qubits, $K = d = 2$ is the only non trivial value of K. Since $D^K(B|A) \leq D^{K+1}(B|A)$, K-classical states are necessarily $(K-1)$-classical, but can be $(K+1)$-discordant (and possibly entangled). An example is a 3×3 state which is a mixture of a maximally entangled state, $1\sqrt{2}[|00\rangle + |11\rangle]$ and a product state, $|22\rangle$, such a state is 2-classical and 3-discordant.

Restricted distributed gates - While discord is usually described as a measure of correlations the K-discord is useful as an indicator of the maximal information which can be gained from a system without disturbing it, moreover it can be used as a meaningful indicator for the classicality of an ensemble.

Definition 2. *An ensemble of states, $\mathcal{L} = \{\rho^i\}$ is K-classical if and only if*

$$D^K\left(\sum_i p_i \rho^i\right) = 0 \tag{7}$$

for all choices of probabilities $\{p_i\}$, $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$.

Here $D^K(AB) = min[D^K(B|A), D^K(A|B)]$. For simplicity we always assume $D^K(AB) = D^K(B|A)$.

To show that K-discord is related to entanglement resources we use the framework of *restricted distributed gates* first introduced in [4]: Alice and Bob may use arbitrary LOCC operations to implement a quantum gate on a restricted set of input states $\mathcal{L}$. This corresponds to realistic situations where the input states are very seldom arbitrary. In particular it corresponds to the case where at each stage of the computation the system is separable. In [4] we showed that even in this simple case entanglement resources are necessary for a successful implementation of a gate on various discordant ensembles. We extend that result here to the more general ensembles used in mixed state quantum computation.

Definition 3. *A bi-local, restricted implementation, $\mathcal{G}_{res}$, of a gate $\mathcal{G}(\rho_{AB}) = U\rho_{AB}U^\dagger$ on an ensemble of states $\mathcal{L} = \{\rho_i^{\text{in}}\}_{i=1}^N$ is a completely positive trace preserving operation that is implemented using LOCC such that for any state $\rho^i \in \mathcal{L}$*

$$\mathcal{G}_{res}(\rho^i_{AB}) = \sum_k M_k \rho^i_{AB} M_k^\dagger \equiv U \rho^i_{AB} U^\dagger \tag{8}$$

with M_k representing a (set of) LOCC operation(s).

The restriction to local operations means that any restricted gate operation is described in the form

$$\mathcal{G}_{res}(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_k \left[\prod_j B_{kj} A_{kj}\right] \rho_{AB} \left[\prod_j B_{kj} A_{kj}\right]^\dagger \tag{9}$$

where A_{kj} and B_{kj} represent an operation performed on Alice or Bob's side respectively. The kth sequence $\left[\prod_j B_{kj} A_{kj}\right] \cdot \left[\prod_j B_{kj}\ A_{kj}\right]^\dagger$ will occour on a state ρ with probability $p_k = \text{tr}\left\{\left[\prod_j B_{kj} A_{kj}\right] \rho_{AB} \left[\prod_j B_{kj} A_{kj}\right]^\dagger\right\}$. Each single operation can be considered a POVM element $E_{akj} = A^\dagger_{kj} A_{kj}$ with outcome a_{kj} or $E_{bkj} = B^\dagger_{kj} B_{kj}$ with b_{kj}.

Definition 4. *A restricted, distributed gate $\mathcal{G}_{res}$ is of order K if there exists a bi-local implementation of this gate, without shared entanglement, where the first POVM (Alice's) has at most K non-trivial ($E_a \not\propto \mathbb{1}$) elements.*

We note here that if a restricted gate can be implemented on all states in the ensemble $\mathcal{L}$ it can also be implemented on any convex combination of these states.

To prove our final result we introduce a different necessary and sufficient condition for K-classicality.

Lemma 2. *A state ρ_{AB} is K-classical if and only if there exists a local POVM with K elements,$\{E_a\}_K$ and a product state $\tau_A \otimes \tau_B$ such that $S[\rho_{AB}||\tau_A \otimes \tau_B] = S[\Lambda_A(\rho)||\Lambda_A(\tau_A \otimes \tau_B)]$ with $\Lambda_A(\cdot) = \sum_{a=1}^K E_a \cdot E_a^\dagger$*

Proof. From lemma 1 the equality above holds if and only if the POVM Λ_A is reversible using local operations. From the definition of K-discord and lemma 1 this reversibility condition is also necessary and sufficient for K-classicality (see proof of Theorem 2). □

Remark: It is possible to generalize the thermal discord (see [1, 9, 13]) to more general POVMs using $D^K_{th}(B|A) = min\{S[\rho_{AB}||\mathbb{1}_{AB}/d_{AB}] - S[\Lambda_A(\rho)||\Lambda_A(\mathbb{1}_{AB}/d_{AB})]\}$.

We are now ready to prove that operations on an ensemble which includes a product state and a K-discordant state require entanglement if the gate is of order K. In the special case of 2-discordant ensembles, this requirement restricts the gate's effective operation to a local unitary on each side.

Lemma 3. *A restricted, distributed gate of order K on an ensemble, $\mathcal{L}$, that includes a product state $\tau_A \otimes \tau_B$ cannot be implemented if the ensemble is K-discordant.*

Proof. Two of the possible inputs of this gate are the product state $\tau_A \otimes \tau_B$ and a K-discordant state. Since, on these states, the restricted gate is equivalent to a unitary operation, the relative entropy between them should not change. However, the first POVM will decrease the relative entropy according to lemma 2. Since relative entropy is non-increasing under LOCC the gate cannot be implemented □

An important special case of this lemma is the $K = 2$ case which does not restric Alice's measurements.

Theorem 3. *A restricted, distributed gate on an ensemble that contains a product state, cannot be implemented without entanglement resources unless the ensemble is* 2*-classical or the implementation does not require communications between the parties.*

Proof follows from lemma 3 and the following observations: The exchange of information requires a measurement; A measurement has at least two possible outcomes; K-discordant states are necessarily $K+1$-discordant.

Adding the results of theorem 1 we get,

Theorem 4. *A restricted, distributed gate on a* 2*-discordant ensemble that includes a product state cannot be implemented without entanglement resources if it changes the discord of any* 2*-discordant state in the ensemble.*

When the product state in question is the completely mixed state, the ensemble also includes the noisy states $\alpha\rho_{AB} + (1-\alpha)\mathbb{1}_{AB}/d_{AB}$ that are used in NMR quantum information processing [14].

Discussion and outlook - The results presented here are useful for tackling a number of questions regarding the role of discord and discordant states in various processes. Although it is not surprising that manipulating discordant states has an associated resouce cost, our results show that any change in discord using local operations results in a loss of information.

In terms of the entanglement cost associated with manipulating discord under LOCC, we discussed a hierarchy of K-discordant states of which discord (or d-discord) is the least sensitive and the 2-discord is the most sensitive indicator of the requirement for entanglement resources. Changing discord in a 2-discordant ensemble requires non-local resources, when the operation is reversible. K-discord may also play a role in finding the number of rounds (times the parties exchange information) required for implementing an operation. It is also related to an open question regarding the difference between the one-way and two-way quantum deficit [1, 15].

Our results are qualitative: we showed that changing discord has an associated cost in terms of resources but we did not calculate this cost explicitly. It would be interesting to find a quantitative relation between discord in an ensemble and the entanglement and communication resources required to manipulate this ensemble. It seems that two parameters play a role: the initial discord (or K-discords) and the change in discord. Such a quantitative result may also answer a practical question: *Are restricted gates an efficient alternative to standard unitary gates?*.

Moreover, a quantitative relation between discord and quantum computation resources provides an operational approach to a long sought-after resource theory for discord. Here discord indicates the need for other resources rather then playing the role of a resource per-se.

Acknowledgements - I thank Daniel Terno and Kavan Modi for useful discussions and comments.

[1] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. (Submitted 2012), arXiv:1112.6238.

[2] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).

[3] A. Datta and A. Shaji, Int. J. Quant. Info. **9**, 1787 (2011), 1109.5549.

[4] A. Brodutch and D. R. Terno, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 010301 (2011).

[5] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).

[6] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).

[7] A. Datta, Ph.D. thesis, The University of New Mexico (2008), arXiv:0807.4490.

[8] S. Gharibian, ArXiv e-prints (2012), 1202.1598.

[9] A. Brodutch and D. R. Terno, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062103 (2010).

[10] D. Petz, Rev. Math. Phys. **15**, 79 (2003).

[11] P. Hayden, R. Jozsa, D. Petz, and A. Winter, Comm. Math. Phys. **246**, 359 (2004).

[12] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).

[13] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012320 (2003).

[14] R. Laflamme, D. G. Cory, C. Negrevergne, and L. Viola, Quat. Inf. Comp. **2**, 166 (2002).

[15] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002).

[16] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1938 (1973).

Appendix A: Strong Subadditivity

For a state ρ_{ABC} on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C$ the strong subadditivity inequality reads [16]

$$S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{BC}) \geq S(\rho_{ABC}) + S(\rho_B) \tag{A1}$$

Which can be rearranged as

$$I(A:BC) \geq I(A:B) \tag{A2}$$

The states which saturate this inequality are or the form [11]:

$$\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i p_i \rho_{AB_i^L} \otimes \rho_{B_i^R C_i} \tag{A3}$$

with $\rho_{B_i^L} \otimes \rho_{B^R}$ belonging to the left and right parts of the space.

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{H}_{B_i^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_i^R} \tag{A4}$$

This means that $\rho_{AB_i^L} \otimes \rho_{B^R C_i} = \mathrm{tr}_{AC}[\rho_{AB_i^L} \otimes \rho_{B^R C_i}] = \rho_{B_i}$ belong to disjoint subspaces, $\rho_{B_i}\rho_{B_j} = \delta_{ij}\rho_{B_i}$. To state it in a different form: one can find orthogonal projectors onto these disjoint subspaces $\hat{\Pi}_i = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{B_i^L} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_i^R}}$ with $\hat{\Pi}_i\hat{\Pi}_j = \delta_{ij}\hat{\Pi}_i$ and $\sum_i \hat{\Pi}_i = \mathbb{1}$ such that $\hat{\Pi}_j \rho_{B_i} \Pi_j = \delta_{ij}\rho_{B_i}$. We use the hat to signify that $\hat{\Pi}_i$ are not necessarily rank-1.

Now let $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \rho_{AB|i} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_c$ where the states $|i\rangle$ are orthogonal and $\rho_{AB|i} \neq \rho_{AB|j}$ for $i \neq j$, then ρ_{ABC} will satisfy eq. A3 if and only if there exist k orthogonal projectors $\hat{\Pi}_{B_i}$ such that $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i \hat{\Pi}_{B_i} \rho_{ABC} \Pi_{B_i}$. This proves the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *A state $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \rho_{AB|i} \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_c$ with $\rho_{AB|i} \neq \rho_{AB|j}$ for $i \neq j$ will satisfy eq. A1 if and only if there exist k orthogonal projectors Π_{B_i} on the subsystem B such that $\sum \Pi_{B_i} = \mathbb{1}_B$ and $\rho_{ABC} = \sum_i \hat{\Pi}_{B_i} \rho_{ABC} \Pi_{B_i}$*

This proposition is also valid if A and C are interchanged.